

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SCHAL RUMBER TOURS DATE	MAL RUGGER TOUGH HAVE THE ST MANEO APPRICANT		E CHAPTON.	
; 08/060,46305/12/93:	CASKEY		D5050C(C)	
		. MARSCHÉL	NAP .	
	18N1/0915			
THOMAS D. FAUL FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI 1301 MCKINNEY		ART CAST	PAPLACIA S	
SUITE 5100		1807	. 50	
HOUSTON, TX 77010-3095		But TE WAS Fra	09/15/94	

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION
THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:
a) S is extended to runer continues to run from the date of the final rejection
b) expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing dato of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, wilf the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.
Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).
Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 8/29/94 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance.
1. The proposed amendments to the claim and /or specification wilf not be entered and tho final rejection stands because:
 There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
b. They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
c. They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
d. They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
e. They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE:
Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. 🂢 Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment 🗵 will be entered 🗌 will not be entered and the status of the claims wilf be as follows:
Claims alfowed:
Claims objected to:
However;
Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): The regnerated 35055, \$112, 2nd para of
4. A The efficient or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because of reasons of record. Applicants arguments directed to specafic. This of Table I do not support the generic range of "scholar Tom's" as a limitation more does the lief of factors influencing Tom. at least they suggest the
5. The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficent reasons why it was not earlier presented. Concept the present hybrids must be formed at reaction temps. The solution the versions present times. The proposed drawing correction has has not been approved by the examiner, noted that applicants did not argue the NEW MATTER of applicants did not argue the NEW MATTER of applicants and less than 18 and 19.
The proposed drawing correction has has not been approved by the examiner noted that applicants did not night that applicant did not night that applicants d
The Other Havi could the supplied
m-elected claims 9-17 transain STEPHANIE W. ZITOMER PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800
PTOL-303 (REV. 5-89)